



Thursday, December 13, 2007

Chula Vista Redevelopment Corporation
276 Fourth Ave, MS C-400
Chula Vista, CA 91910

RE: Excuse or tardiness from today's CRVC meeting

Esteemed Board Members:

At present I have a commitment which places me to be potentially late or absent for today's CRVC meeting. I will try my hardest to be there. I apologize for this late notice.

Respectfully,

Hector A. Reyes, AIA
President, CEO

DRAFT

MINUTES OF ADJOURNED REGULAR MEETINGS OF THE CITY COUNCIL AND THE CHULA VISTA REDEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

September 4, 2007

6:00 P.M.

Adjourned Regular Meetings of the City Council and the Chula Vista Redevelopment Corporation were called to order at 6:16 p.m. in the Police Department Community Room, 315 Fourth Avenue, Chula Vista, California.

ROLL CALL: Councilmembers: Castaneda, McCann, Ramirez, Rindone (arrived at 6:10 p.m.), and Mayor Cox

Chula Vista Redevelopment Corporation Directors: Munoz, Paul, Reyes, Rooney, Salas, and Chair Lewis

ABSENT: Chula Vista Redevelopment Corporation Director Desrochers

ALSO PRESENT: City Manager/Executive Director Garcia, City Attorney/General Counsel Moore, City Clerk Bigelow, Senior Deputy City Clerk Peoples, Acting Community Development Director Hix, Redevelopment Manager Crockett, Principal Community Development Specialist Lee, and Planning and Building Director Sandoval

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG AND MOMENT OF SILENCE

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Steve Molski, Chula Vista resident representing the Coalition of Mobilehome Owners, asked the Mayor and Council to review and bring back a report for mobilehome park tenants on Assembly Bill 1542 (Evans) and "Senate Bill 981 (Padilla).

CONSENT CALENDAR
(Item 1)

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES of the City Council and Chula Vista Redevelopment Corporation for March 22, 2007, April 12, 2007, April 26, 2007, May 24, 2007 and June 14, 2007.

Staff recommendation: The City Council and CVRC approve the minutes.

ACTION: Deputy Mayor Rindone moved to approve the minutes. Councilmember Castaneda seconded the motion, and it carried 8-0-3 on the minutes of March 22, April 12, May 24 and June 14, with Directors Munoz, Reyes and Salas abstaining because they were not on the CVRC at the time of the meetings; and 7-0-4 on the minutes of April 26, with Councilmember Castaneda abstaining because he was not present at the meeting and Directors Munoz, Reyes and Salas abstaining because they were not on the CVRC at the time of the meetings.

DRAFT

WORKSHOP

2. Discussion on the Reorganization of Community Development/Redevelopment and the Roles and Responsibilities of the Chula Vista Redevelopment Corporation.

City Manager/Executive Director Garcia discussed the proposed reorganization of the Community Development Department into the Redevelopment Agency and Housing Authority, which would also provide staffing for the CVRC and Redevelopment Advisory Committee (RAC). The Community Development Department would be replaced by Redevelopment, which would have the primary responsibility for implementing the redevelopment plan in Chula Vista. planning functions would be placed back under the Planning Department, economic development would be centralized in the City Manager's office. The City Manager would continue to hold the responsibilities of both the City Manager and Executive Director of the Redevelopment Agency. Additionally, there would be a Deputy Director position in charge of administration. The proposal also included the removal of staff from under the City umbrella to become at-will employees of the Redevelopment Agency. The redevelopment and housing project staff assignments were then presented, along with the roles and responsibilities of the CVRC. Also proposed were adding tentative maps to the planning side; and the ability to enter into contracts with consultants, contractors and vendors, solicit participation by developers through requests for quotes and requests for proposals, and acquire property, not through eminent domain on the redevelopment side.

Next, City Manager Garcia outlined the current process to approve a tentative map and the proposed delegation of tentative map approvals to the CVRC in order to streamline the process. The current process is a very intensive public participation process in that a project has to go before the Redevelopment Advisory Committee, through the public hearing process, then the CVRC reviews it and goes through the decision-making process, and then another hearing and review is held at the Council level. The overall process for the developer is 90-120 days, and the proposed change is being recommended to reduce this time by one-third.

City Manager/Executive Director Garcia then reviewed the proposed additions to the CVRC roles and responsibilities.

Councilmember Ramirez asked that color copies be provided in the future when staff reports state that there are distinguishing colors.

City Manager/Executive Director Garcia clarified that the items presented were only recommendations. If the Council decided to move forward with the recommendations, staff would incorporate them into the bylaws and bring them back for adoption.

Councilmember Castaneda expressed concern about the bylaws, which were established when it was envisioned that the Council would be part of the process; they provided more latitude because five publicly-elected officials were on the board.

City Manager/Executive Director Garcia restated that the Redevelopment Agency was a failed process that was not working and needed to be fixed. The proposed structure would ensure that projects moved forward to a successful completion.

WORKSHOP (Continued)

2-2

DRAFT

Councilmember Ramirez commented that the failure of the Redevelopment Agency was due to the lack of public trust. City Manager Garcia confirmed the lack of trust due to the failures over many years. He explained that the Agency depended on private sector funding, so the dynamic needed to be changed to convince the community, as well as the developers and banks, that redevelopment in Chula Vista was a good thing. The proposed reorganization and recommendations would assist in accomplishing this.

In concluding his presentation, City Manager Garcia stated that staff also wanted to include an appeal process to address concerns with decisions made by the CVRC. Such a process would mirror the Planning Commission appeal process, and decisions would be appealable to the City Council.

Susan Luzzaro, Chula Vista resident, requested a reevaluation of the selection process for Redevelopment Advisory Committee members, stating it was not appropriate to have real estate lobbyists serving on the committee. She also encouraged the Council not to give up its decision-making powers.

Steve Molski, Chula Vista resident, stated that he did not see any blighted areas in Chula Vista; that he was opposed to the Council granting authority to anyone, especially outsiders; and that the working class people needed more consideration.

Councilmember Ramirez stated that it was important for the public to understand that the elected officials were accountable to the public, and that the City Manager was accountable to the Council and did not do anything unless instructed to do so by them. He further stated that the public needed to hold the Council accountable.

Norberto Salazar, Chula Vista resident representing the Southwest Chula Vista Civic Association, stated that giving the CVRC additional authority was a bad idea. Political appointees who were not accountable to the public should not be allowed to make decisions.

Jackie Lancaster, Chula Vista resident, stated that most of the tax increment went back to the Redevelopment Agency for more redevelopment and not the citizen's benefit. Further, citizens did not want the City to become a grid-locked metropolis; and the Council should represent the citizens and not have the CVRC making decisions or it will become a Centre City Development Corporation as in San Diego, with the City being turned over to developers.

Theresa Acerro, Chula Vista resident and President of the Southwest Chula Vista Civic Association, stated that her membership voted to dissolve the CVRC and had concerns with any decision-making process being turned over to a body not comprised of Chula Vista residents. She further stated that the Council was distancing itself, thereby creating a greater lack of trust.

Patricia Aguilar, Chula Vista resident representing Crossroads II, stated that her organization supported the proposed staff reorganization, but did not support the proposed increase in responsibility to the CVRC, especially with regard to planning functions.

Peter Watry, Chula Vista resident, stated that the Council could not delegate final authority to people who lived outside the City, as it was illegal, and if not, it was wrong and unacceptable to have someone who lives elsewhere make final decisions over elected officials.

WORKSHOP (continued)

2-3

DRAFT

Frank Zimmery, Chula Vista resident, stated that the Council assured residents that its members would sit on the CVRC to protect the interests of Chula Vista citizens, and that the Council would be the authoritative body of the Redevelopment Agency, but the proposal placed the authority in the hands of the CVRC. He proposed that, rather than looking at ways to expand the CVRC, the Council should look at ways to eliminate it, as it was not responsible to the citizens and the proposal was regressive. Further, he stated that elected officials held the responsibility and should not delegate it to others.

Pamela Bensoussan, Chula Vista resident representing the Northwest Civic Association, stated that her organization supported the recommendations to eliminate the Community Development Department and reorganize staff. Further, there was a big need in the west for park acquisition and development fees and transportation development impact fees like in the east, which, when put into place, would have a positive effect. Lastly, she stated that trust could not be grown in the community without keeping the pledge of accountability and by transferring the tentative map decision making to the CVRC.

Earl Jentz, Chula Vista resident, provided his perspective on redevelopment, stating that more and not less accountability was needed. Tax increment funds needed to go to the community, and the shifting of responsibility as proposed created distrust. Mr. Jentz then provided a handout from his attorney that stated that Chula Vista Charter Section 602(d) requires all members of City boards and commissions with decision-making authority to be City residents. City Attorney/General Counsel Moore responded to the comments and handout, stating that the Charter provision quoted pertained to City boards and commissions, not non-profit corporations such as the CVRC. Further, under the Map Act, the Council was allowed to delegate responsibility if the decision was made to do so. It would be delegated by ordinance to the non-profit, which was different than what was in the Charter. Further, when the CVRC was formed, research was found in court cases that allowed governmental agencies to delegate to non-profit corporations, and there were case law and Attorney General decisions that stated there was no requirement for members to be residents of the City. Additionally, decisions made by the CVRC were appealable to the Council, so they were not considered to be final decisions. Peter Watry, Chula Vista resident, stated that the City Attorney was wrong. The City of San Diego delegated a lot of authority to the CCDC, and to be on the CCDC, members were required to be residents of the City of San Diego.

Kevin O'Neill, Chula Vista resident, stated that the Redevelopment Agency attempts had been dysfunctional, and something had to be done to move forward. Redevelopment and development would be the salvation of the City, and industry and commerce were needed in order to provide jobs and sales tax to the City to allow for the things that everyone wanted. He encouraged the Council to try something new.

Jose Preciado, Chula Vista resident and president of the South Bay Forum, stated that he cared deeply about the recommendations and concerns of those who had spoken prior to him, but that everyone needed to work together to move forward and meet the challenges facing the City. Mr. Preciado stated that while he did not see the appointees as negative individuals in the process, he was concerned about delegating authority, as the speakers before him had expressed concerns about trust.

2-A

DRAFT

WORKSHOP (Continued)

Jack Stanley agreed that the Redevelopment Agency had not worked, stating that Chula Vista was, without question, the worst place to get a permit. He stated that a policy needed to be established for a property owner whose plans met code to be able to have a permit within two weeks.

Josie Calderon, Chula Vista resident representing the Mexican American Business Association, stated that citizens needed to trust the judgment of the Mayor and Council in appointing members to the CVRC who will do the right thing, and she cited CVRC Director Paul as one of the strongest advocates for the South Bay. Ms. Calderon acknowledged that change was hard, but that the Council was elected to make decisions for those who elected them to do so. Although many citizens were present at the meeting, there were many more who do not speak out or attend meetings, but who requested change and elected the City Council to bring that change as they see fit. People needed to trust those who are appointed by their elected officials.

Susan Lazarro, Chula Vista resident, stated that the logic of "streamlining" was not solid, was basically disenfranchising residents, and that there needed to be more real public participation. She then stated that two members of the RAC were paid lobbyists and had already made decisions on projects prior to hearing public input.

At 8:07 p.m., Mayor Cox recessed the meeting. At 8:22 p.m., she reconvened the meeting with all members except Director Desrochers present. She asked staff to respond to comments by speakers, as follows: 1) what money from the Redevelopment Agency is used for, 2) who has final authority on a project, 3) whether the UCSP plan was flawed, 4) the appeal process to the City Council, and 5) how the recommendations provide more accountability.

Redevelopment Manager Crockett explained historically how redevelopment monies have been used, the majority towards the bayfront. Councilmember McCann suggested that the historical perspective be updated and reintroduced to the RAC, CVRC, and public groups. He then reiterated that successful redevelopment would provide funding to fill potholes, build sidewalks and streets where there are none, and attract restaurants.

City Manager Garcia said he believed there were ways to improve the Urban Core Specific Plan. While he was not yet with the City during the process, he understood that there were some things that were not addressed or delayed, but he felt there was nothing that could not be fixed. He also explained that the Council would still have the final authority on all decisions for a project. The key would be to have the technical work in terms of soliciting developers, initial plans, dealing with architects and engineers, conceptual development, and the nuts and bolts of developing redevelopment projects be vested with the CVRC. The final authority on the approval of developers, development agreements, financing plans, and redevelopment projects would still be vested with the Council, particularly with regard to money, financing and land use changes. He also commented that the appeal process was designed to allow people who were not satisfied with a decision made by the CVRC (developer or community group) to appeal that decision to the Council, similar to the process utilized with the Planning Commission.

Councilmember Ramirez asked why autonomy, as mentioned in the staff report, was important. Mr. Crockett explained that the idea was to work in the public eye, move projects forward, and reach decisions using Council direction as identified in the strategic plan and budget in order to eliminate redundancies in the process. City Manager Garcia further explained that the autonomy meant to refer merely to organizational autonomy, meaning that staff would work for the Executive Director of the CVRC.

2-5

DRAFT

WORKSHOP (continued)

CVRC Chair Lewis requested comments by CVRC members.

Director Munoz, a licensed civil engineer, stated that normally a tentative map was 100% prepared by staff following City ordinances, codes and municipal requirements. It then went to the governing authority for final approval, and the conditions of approval were built into the final map. A licensed civil engineer would then be required to sign and stamp the map. He stated that two licensed civil engineers currently serve on the CVRC Board, and both were familiar with the process. Lastly, he stated that he hoped, as a CVRC Director, to use his expertise and knowledge to present projects to the Council for final approval.

Director Salas stated that he had applied to be on the CVRC Board due to concerns about what was and was not happening on the west side of Chula Vista. He had observed an influx of "poverty retail," such as check cashing businesses that did not sustain a living wage. Further, he was committed to looking at a project to determine if it would benefit those living in the area today; if not, he would not support the project. He mentioned that trust was paramount, and the Council needed to trust those they appointed. The Council would continue to control the purse strings, set policy and make the final decisions. Councilmember Ramirez stated for the record that while he trusted all of the CVRC members, the community needed to trust the Council; and he believed it was the responsibility of the Council to build the trust with the community so that the City could move forward. He said he believed the trust needed to be built prior to passing on tools to the CVRC.

Director Paul stated that the seven CVRC Directors had a combined professional experience of over 200 years, offered gratis to the community as public servants. The Directors took their positions on faith that the City as a whole wanted redevelopment to succeed. He believed that because of Chula Vista's size and location, there was ample opportunity to put money into the City and address community needs. He stated that more should be done to invite both public and private partnerships to invest in infrastructure; and that developers would come when they felt there was a degree of fairness and they could obtain a return on investments. He pointed out that redevelopment was successful in many cities throughout the state and should be given a chance in Chula Vista.

Director Reyes stated that he was a Chula Vista resident and business owner investing his personal time in the community, and that he saw the need to streamline the process and make it simple in order to make it successful. He encouraged anyone interested to contact him directly, should they want to get to know him better or if they had any questions.

Director Rooney stated that he chose to become involved because of the possibility of making exciting things happen in the City, and that his heart was here, even though he was not a resident. He described his expertise in architecture/planning and expressed his view that the CCDC was not a bad example of redevelopment. He stated that he was committed to listening to the community and would not ignore Council direction or citizen input. He said that tentative maps would be evaluated based on the General Plan and Urban Core Specific Plan and would have to conform to all requirements therein. Having served on the CVRC for the last two years, he said he had experienced the lack of results due to a structure that bogged projects down, and he commended the Council and City Manager for taking action to remedy the situation.

2-6

DRAFT

WORKSHOP (continued)

Chair Lewis stated that the CVRC members had tried to work as a tool for the Council to get something done that had not been successfully done before and also to help the Council earn the community trust. If the proposed changes would facilitate and expedite the process, making sure projects went forward with limited obstacles, and provided predictability on the part of the Council, staff and community, they would be welcome changes. Further, he stated that responsibility and accountability could not be delegated, only authority. Successful private-sector companies appoint people to make decisions and then they get out of their way and allow them to do what they do. The results are that everybody wins. He encouraged the Council to vest the CVRC with responsibilities and then let them get the job done.

Councilmember Ramirez stated that Chairman Lewis' comments were compelling except he believed that trust was not yet earned, a good framework had not yet been established, the Urban Core Specific Plan was horribly flawed, and fundamental elements were missing in order to be able to go forward. He believed the CVRC members were the experts, but that the Council had to build trust with the community before handing off responsibility.

Councilmember Castaneda stated that he was struggling to come up with the right mix to create the right environment for the CVRC so that when the projects came forward, they could be reviewed and the right decisions made for the community. He expressed concerns regarding finances and what property might be purchased during the course of the year, and the types of contracts that could be let. He said he would like to limit contracts on consultants to be land-use only. He then thanked the CVRC members and expressed his trust in them for committing their time to try to help the City.

Councilmember McCann spoke regarding the need for everyone to work together to bring good things to the west side, while facing certain facts like the budget shortfall, decaying streets, and boarded-up restaurants and businesses. He stated that he believed that there were more things agreed upon than disagreed upon, and that now was the critical time, since if something is not done, the west side and older areas would become more costly and difficult to revitalize. The only option was for everyone to come together as a community and tackle it now. Further, he stated that a well-run redevelopment program was needed to provide quality projects and attract restaurants, bookstores, and amenities that were wanted.

Deputy Mayor Rindone summarized that there was agreement that the Redevelopment Agency had not achieved the expected goals over the years, that changes needed to be made to jumpstart the process, and that the RAC had been an excellent outcome of the process. He further stated that he saw the potential to structure a process that was significantly beneficial to the community. With the redesign of the CVRC, he saw seven outstanding members committed to assisting the City. He did not believe the concern about the tentative map was as critical as eliminating what he viewed as the major distraction that had caused the Redevelopment Agency to be unsuccessful, which was lack of direction on the part of the staff and the Council. He then noted that the new City Manager came from the largest redevelopment agency in California and understood the value of the agency and how to accomplish what needed to be accomplished to be successful. In closing, he stated he was encouraged about a new City Manager who wanted to make a difference; a City staff being reorganized to provide the process; a strong community voice via the RAC; an area of expertise second to none, and similar to a lot of other successful city redevelopment agencies, assembled in this City, unique to this City, and very dedicated to this City; and a commitment from the Council to do whatever was possible to move redevelopment forward.

2-7

DRAFT

WORKSHOP (continued)

Councilmember Ramirez stated he was optimistic but felt that the downside to not spending the time and making the effort to get and build consensus with the community upfront would make things counterproductive. Further, he stated that there was a gap in accountability, and to remove the decision making a step further would not be good for the community at this time.

Mayor Cox noted a memo from the City Attorney stating that the legislative body could not delegate its essential legislative functions, such as making or changing laws, but could delegate the quasi-legislative, quasi-judicial and administrative functions as long as there were standards in place. She then reviewed the proposed changes to the CVRC roles and responsibilities, stating that she fully supported the City Manager's recommendations, as he was hired based on his experience and expertise. She suggested that the CVRC hold a joint workshop with the RAC to talk about their working relationship. She also encouraged the Council to direct the City Manager to work with the City Attorney to revise the bylaws so that the substance of the decisions could be forwarded to the CVRC, putting the tentative map in a holding pattern only if necessary. City Manager Garcia stated that he would proceed with drafting the bylaws and present them to the CVRC for approval and recommendation to the Council for amendments, deletions and formal action.

OTHER BUSINESS

3. CITY MANAGER'S REPORTS

City Manager Garcia advised the Council that the City was in the midst of a budget challenge and that he had spoken with the bond insurers and reassured them that the problem would be under control, with a plan in place by the end of the calendar year and the shortfall corrected by the end of the fiscal year. Additionally, he had met with over 600 City employees over the past few weeks and implemented four major initiatives, which were to make the hiring freeze permanent; look at department reorganizations that affect seven departments, including the City Manager's Office; propose an early retirement program being developed by Human Resources; and request all departments to prepare plans to reduce their expenditures by 10%. Work sessions would be held with the Council in October, and approval would be requested the first of November. Additionally, he stated that everyone in the organization was engaged in the discussions, and that he had met with the unions, Department Heads, and managers, who were all working to present solutions.

4. MAYOR'S/CHAIRMAN'S REPORTS

Mayor Cox stated that the Department of Mayor and Council would also be looking at a 10% budget reduction, and she anticipated having an item on the agenda in October for the Council's consideration.

Chair Lewis stated that he was pleased to have not only a new City Manager but also a Chief Executive Officer, in the truest sense of the word, to assist with redevelopment and that he and the CVRC Board welcomed City Manager Garcia and looked forward to having a close working relationship with him.

2-8

DRAFT

OTHER BUSINESS (Continued)

5. COUNCIL COMMENTS

Councilmember McCann thanked the public and CVRC members, as well as City Manager Garcia, for their participation in the workshop.

ADJOURNMENT

At 9:57 p.m., Mayor Cox adjourned the City Council to the Regular Meeting of September 11, 2007 at 6:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers, and Chair Lewis adjourned the Chula Vista Redevelopment Corporation to its Regular Meeting of September 27, 2007 at 6:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers, noting that the Regular Meeting of September 13, 2007 had been cancelled.

Lori Anne Peoples, MMC, Senior Deputy City Clerk

2-9

DRAFT
MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
OF THE CHULA VISTA REDEVELOPMENT CORPORATION (CVRC)

November 8, 2007

6:00 P.M.

A Regular Meeting of the Chula Vista Redevelopment Corporation was called to order at 6:02 p.m. in the Council Chambers, located in City Hall, 276 Fourth Avenue, Chula Vista, California.

CVRC ROLL CALL

PRESENT: Directors: Desrochers, Munoz, Paul, Reyes, Rooney, and Chair Lewis

ABSENT: Directors: Salas

ALSO PRESENT: Executive Director/City Manager Garcia, Deputy General Counsel Shirey, Deputy City Attorney Cusato, Redevelopment Manager Crockett, Planning Manager Ladiana, Associate Planner Pease, Real Property Manager Ryals, Principal Community Development Specialist Lee, Senior Community Development Specialist Kluth, Senior Deputy City Clerk Peoples, Senior Administrative Secretary Fields

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE, MOMENT OF SILENCE

SWEETWATER UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT PRESENTATION

Chairman Lewis announced that Director Reyes had a potential conflict of interest and would be recusing himself from this and all future matters pertaining to the Sweetwater Union High School District. Director Reyes left the dais and Council Chambers.

Bruce Husson of Sweetwater Union High School, introduced representatives from his organization who were present in the audience, and made a presentation on the SUHS District "Assets Utilization Project". The presentation contained a brief history, the current status, recommended solutions, alternatives available to the District, and District requests of the City/CVRC.

Arlie Ricassa, President of the Sweetwater Union High School District Board, spoke in support of the project.

Chief Executive Officer Garcia referred the CVRC Board to the Subcommittee report dated August 20th, which provided a very detailed analysis of what had occurred to date.

CONSENT

1. WRITTEN COMMUNICATION

Memorandum from Doug Paul requesting an excused absence from the CVRC meeting of September 27, 2007.

Staff Recommendation: That the CVRC excuse the absence.

2-10

DRAFT

CONSENT (continued)

ACTION: Director Rooney moved to approve the request for excused absence. Director Munoz seconded the motion and it carried 4-0-1-2 with Director Paul abstaining, Director Salas absent, and Director Reyes away from the dais.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Staff Recommendation:

That the CVRC approve the minutes of September 27, 2007.

ACTION: Director Rooney moved approval of the CVRC minutes of September 27, 2007. Director Munoz seconded the motion, and it carried 5-0-0-2 with Director Salas absent and Director Reyes away from the dais.

That the CVRC approve the minutes of October 11, 2007.

ACTION: Director Rooney moved approval of the CVRC minutes of October 11, 2007. Director Munoz seconded the motion, and it carried 5-0-0-2 with Director Salas absent and Director Reyes away from the dais.

2.1 Acknowledgement of appointment for the Chula Vista Redevelopment Corporation Secretary

ACTION: Motion by Director Rooney to adopt CVRC Resolution No. 2007-029, heading read, text waived:

CVRC RESOLUTION NO. 2007-029, RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CHULA VISTA REDEVELOPMENT CORPORATION ACKNOWLEDGING APPOINTMENT OF SECRETARY OF THE CORPORATION BY THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

Director Munoz seconded the motion, and it carried 5-0-0-2 with Director Salas absent and Director Reyes away from the dais.

Director Reyes returned to the dais.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were none.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

3. PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER DRC-07-33, RETAIL AND MEDICAL OFFICE COMPLEX AT 1310-1318 THIRD AVENUE

Tony Zamir has submitted a design review application for development of a 1.23-acre site located on the west side of Third Avenue, south of Palomar Street, in the Merged Chula Vista Redevelopment Project Area. The proposal involves a three-building, 14,360 square foot retail/medical complex for multi-tenant site. No Redevelopment Agency involvement (financing, agreements) is associated with the project.

2-11

DRAFT

PUBLIC HEARINGS (continued)

Notice of the hearing was given in accordance with legal requirements, and the hearing was held on the date and at the time specified in the notice.

Chairman Lewis opened the public hearing.

Planning Manager Ladiana provided the project introduction, and Project Planner Pease provided the staff report.

Director Reyes expressed concerns with the 25-foot setback.

With no members of the public wishing to speak, Chairman Lewis closed the public hearing.

ACTION: Motion by Director Desrochers, to adopt CVRC Resolution No. 2007-030 heading read, text waived:

CVRC RESOLUTION NO. 2007-030, RESOLUTION OF THE CHULA VISTA REDEVELOPMENT CORPORATION APPROVING DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT (DRC-07-33) TO ALLOW THE CONSTRUCTION OF A 14,360 SQUARE FOOT RETAIL/MEDICAL OFFICE COMPLEX ON THE SITE LOCATED AT 1310-1318 THIRD AVENUE

Director Munoz seconded the motion, and it carried 6-0-0-1 with Director Salas absent.

4. BAYVISTA WALK MIXED-USE (COMMERCIAL/RESIDENTIAL) PROJECT

Olson Urban Housing, LLC (Applicant) has submitted applications requesting a zone change, precise plan, conditional use permit, design review, and a tentative map for development of a mixed-use project on a 4.89-acre site located at 765-795 Palomar, between Industrial Boulevard and Frontage Road in the Southwest Redevelopment Project Area. The project includes 154 units and 5-10,000sf of retail space. The site has been vacant for several years and was used as a temporary site for the sale of pumpkins and Christmas trees. The Redevelopment Agency will be involved in the development of a portion of the site for podium-type housing.

Notice of the hearing was given in accordance with legal requirements, and the hearing was held on the date and at the time specified in the notice.

Redevelopment Manager Crockett stated that staff had received a request from the applicant to withdraw the item.

ACTION ITEMS

5. TRANSFER OF "RADOS" PROPERTY

2-12

DRAFT

ACTION ITEMS (continued)

In 1999, in order to increase the economic development potential for the land south of H Street adjacent to the Marina in the Bayfront Redevelopment Project Area, the Chula Vista Redevelopment Agency entered into a series of agreements with the Port of San Diego and BF Goodrich to relocate and consolidate the campus of one of the City's largest employers. The agreements identified a number of properties to be conveyed to BFG to facilitate the redevelopment of the site. The agency acquired the Rados property in 2003 and in accordance with the terms of the relocation agreement is prepared to transfer ownership to BFG.

Senior Community Development Specialist Kluth presented the staff report, and responded to questions of the Directors.

Mr. Sullivan, representing BFGoodrich, responded to questions of the Directors.

Redevelopment Manager Crockett responded to questions of the Directors.

ACTION: Motion by Director Paul to adopt CVRC Resolution No. 2007-031, heading read, text waived:

CVRC RESOLUTION NO. 2007-031, RESOLUTION OF THE CHULA VISTA REDEVELOPMENT CORPORATION RECOMMENDING THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY APPROVE AND EXECUTE THE IMPLEMENTATION AGREEMENT AND ANY NECESSARY DOCUMENTS BY AND BETWEEN THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE CITY OF CHULA VISTA AND ROHR, INC., OPERATING AS BFGOODRICH AEROSTRUCTURES GROUP, AND THE TRANSFER OF THE RADOS PARCEL AT 798 F STREET IN CHULA VISTA TO ROHR, INC.

Director Reyes seconded the motion, and it carried 6-0-0-1 with Director Salas absent.

5.1. EXCLUSIVE NEGOTIATING AGREEMENT WITH GALAXY COMMERCIAL HOLDING, LLC FOR PROPERTIES IN THE E STREET VISITOR TRANSIT FOCUS AREA

On August 29, 2007, Galaxy Commercial Holding, LLC ("Galaxy") submitted to the Community Development Department a Statement of Qualifications ("SOQ") and conceptual development proposal for the development of several properties located in the City's E Street Visitor Transit Focus Area ("TFA"). This particular location is one of three TFAs in the City designated by the 2005 General Plan Update and 2007 Urban Core Specific Plan, allowing the greatest densities and heights in the City. The proposed ENA properties consist of two existing hotel/motel sites that comprise 2.44 acres (106,189 square feet) of land located immediately adjacent to the E Street Trolley Station. Galaxy is currently under contract to purchase the subject properties.

Principal Community Development Specialist Lee provided the staff report, and responded to questions of the Directors.

DRAFT

ACTION ITEMS (continued)

Redevelopment Manager Crockett responded to questions of the Directors.

Chairman Lewis requested staff work on shortening the timeframes relating to projects.

ACTION: Motion by Director Desrochers to adopt CVRC Resolution No. 2007-032, heading read, text waived:

CVRC RESOLUTION NO. 2007-032, RESOLUTION OF THE CHULA VISTA REDEVELOPMENT CORPORATION APPROVING AN EXCLUSIVE NEGOTIATING AGREEMENT WITH GALAXY COMMERCIAL HOLDING, LLC FOR PROPERTIES LOCATED ON THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF E STREET AND WOODLAWN AVENUE

Director Paul seconded the motion, and it carried 6-0-0-1 with Director Salas absent.

6. CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORTS

Chief Executive Officer Garcia commented that in talking with the Community Development staff, there had been a number of Exclusive Negotiating Agreement cancellations due to the economy, but staff would be working on preparing a presentation for the Board to bring them up to speed on the area at a future meeting.

7. CHAIRMAN'S REPORTS

Chairman Lewis stated that he had extended an invitation to the Redevelopment Advisory Committee (RAC) members to join the CVRC in a public workshop to be scheduled for December 6, 2007 at 5:00 p.m. in the John Lippitt Public Works Center. The goal would be to work together to collaboratively promote and enhance public involvement in the redevelopment process.

Chairman Lewis then requested the Board give some serious thought over the holidays and think of potential ways to attract projects, put together some requests for proposals, and take a more active role in the market to become more proactive, not reactive.

8. DIRECTORS' COMMENTS

CVRC SUBCOMMITTEE UPDATE ON FOLLOW-UP ITEMS FROM OCTOBER 11, 2007 CVRC WORKING SESSION

Director Rooney provided the Subcommittee update on follow-up items from the October 11, 2007 working session.

2-14

DRAFT

ADJOURNMENT

At 8:24 p.m., Chairman Lewis adjourned the meeting to a joint Working Session with the Redevelopment Advisory Committee scheduled on December 6, 2007 at 5:00 pm.

Eric Crockett, Secretary

2-15

DRAFT

MINUTES OF A SPECIAL JOINT MEETING OF THE CHULA VISTA REDEVELOPMENT CORPORATION (CVRC) AND REDEVELOPMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE (RAC)

December 6, 2007

5:00 p.m.

A Special Joint Meeting of the Chula Vista Redevelopment Corporation and Redevelopment Advisory Committee was called to order at 5:10 p.m. in the John Lippitt Public Works Center, 1800 Maxwell Road, Chula Vista, California.

CVRC ROLL CALL

PRESENT: Director: Desrochers, Munoz, Paul, Reyes, Rooney, Salas, and Chair Lewis

ABSENT: Director: None

RAC ROLL CALL

PRESENT: Primary Member: Bensoussan, Aguilar, Rovira-Osterwalder, Acerro, Johnson, D'Ascoli, Hogan, Felber, Mosolgo, and Chair Moctezuma

Alternate Member: Scott, Zimmerly, Cohen, Smyth, Gilgun, Tripp

ABSENT: Primary Member: None

Alternate Member: Marchand

ALSO PRESENT

CONSULTANTS: Cynthia Henson and Mark Weaver of Henson Consulting Group

STAFF: Assistant Redevelopment & Housing Director Crockett, Planning & Building Director Sandoval, Assistant Planning & Building Director Lytle, Planning Manager Ladiana, Redevelopment & Housing Manager Mills, Principal Project Coordinator Hines, Principal Project Coordinator Lee, Senior Project Coordinator Do, Senior Project Coordinator Kluth, Project Coordinator Davis, Project Coordinator Dorado, Project Coordinator Johnson, Senior Secretary Welch, Senior Secretary Montiel, Senior Deputy City Clerk Peoples, Senior Administrative Secretary Fields

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE, MOMENT OF SILENCE

2-16

DRAFT

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Frank Luzzaro, Chula Vista resident, expressed concern about conflict of interest issues related to representation of certain organizations by specific RAC members.

PUBLIC COMMENTS (continued)

Jack Stanley, Chula Vista business owner, stated his desire to expedite the redevelopment process in Chula Vista by eliminating review bodies, such as the CVRC and RAC.

DISCUSSION ITEM

1. JOINT WORKING SESSION OF THE CVRC AND RAC

The CVRC Board of Directors and Redevelopment Advisory Committee held a four-hour, joint working session about the redevelopment process and opportunities for CVRC-RAC collaboration to promote and enhance public involvement in the process. The discussion included an overview of the CVRC and RAC by staff and a subgroup breakout session involving six subgroup tables. Each subgroup table consisted of a CVRC Director, RAC members, staff, and the public, and was tasked to respond to three assigned questions: (1) What methods have you seen work well in getting input from the public in Chula Vista and other places? Why? (2) How can we be proactive in gaining the most appropriate level of public input? (3) What are your ideas about how the RAC could interface with the CVRC? Subgroups recorded their responses on flipcharts and made presentations to the full group. The recorded responses have been transcribed and are attached these minutes as Attachment 1. Additional follow-up discussion will take place on the CVRC and RAC.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORTS

None.

CHAIRMAN'S REPORTS

None.

DIRECTORS' COMMENTS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

At 9:05 p.m., CVRC Chair Lewis adjourned the Chula Vista Redevelopment Corporation to its regularly scheduled meeting of December 13, 2007 at 6:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers. RAC Chair Moctezuma adjourned the Redevelopment Advisory Committee to its next meeting in 2008.

2-17

DRAFT

Eric Crockett, Secretary

2-18

DRAFT

12/06/2007 CVRC-RAC Working Session

Flipchart Data from Subgroup Breakout Session

Question #1: What methods have you seen work well in getting input from the public in Chula Vista and other places? Why?

Table 1:

Paul Desrochers, CVRC
Brian Felber, RAC
Lisa Cohen, RAC
Gerry Scott, RAC
Mandy Mills, Staff
Dan Hom, Public

- Workshops throughout city
- Door-to-Door
- Expand notice area
- Direct Contact
 - Mail
 - Phone
 - E-mail interest list
 - Web
 - Established networks: RAC, CAC, Crossroads, NWCA
 - Gatherings – announcements
- Advertisement, not just public notice
 - Maybe list on front – what items
 - Organize public notices

Table 2:

Chris Lewis, CVRC
Lisa Moctezuma, RAC
Eric Mosolgo, RAC
Frank Zimmerly, RAC
Jim Sandoval, Staff
Sarah Johnson, Staff

- Proposal of a controversial project
- Hold meetings in neighborhoods in a informal, comfortable setting (e.g., elementary school)
- Bring developer to answer questions
- Document concerns discussed during the meeting
- Talk to developer to see what can be done to address community issues
- Explain how project would change the community - circle back
- Take visuals to affected community
- Personal One-on-One discussions
- Early advertisement of projects – let people know what the project consists of
- Something personal – specific to project, rather than standard postcard
- Work through local Schools
- Post notice on project site – give community a contact phone number to call
- Send out postcards – then follow up with calls, and door-to-door visits to see if they received a postcard and what comments they have
- Take pictures of and talk one-on-one
- Encourage, not discourage input. Specifically ask for input
- Staff is very aware and can answer questions about projects
- Way for community to receive input without having to come to meeting / send in written comments
- Not much has worked well

DRAFT

<p>Table 3 Doug Paul, CVRC J.J. Hogan, RAC Theresa Acerro, RAC Gregory Smyth, RAC Leilani Hines, Staff Mitch Thompson, Public</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Haven't seen one – difficult to get a sense from constituents • Time limitations participation – limited • People need to feel heard • Speak their language • Positive reinforce • Teach public to advocate • Positive reinforcement • Door to Door • Ensure Representation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Advocate on RAC/CVRC - Appropriate - Should live in area (except technical groups)
<p>Table 4 Hector Reyes, CVRC Lisa Johnson, RAC Lynda Gilgun, RAC Eric Crockett, Staff Diem Do, Staff Edgardo Moctezuma, Public</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notices of meetings in variety of sources • Broaden “area of interest” for notices <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project dependent - Staff decision/flexibility • Notify Community groups (Rotary, Optimist, PTAs) • Self addressed/paid postcard asking for “vote” of support or non-support • Disseminate info earlier – “coming soon” on the website • Door-to-Door Invite
<p>Table 5 Chris Rooney, CVRC Rafael Muñoz, CVRC Tanya Roviro-Osterwalder, RAC Patricia Aguilar, RAC Ken Lee, Staff Glen Googins, Public</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Worked Well <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meetings in the community - Neighborhoods most impacted by projects - Inherent interest in projects from affected residents/businesses is necessary - Independent input from affected residents/businesses - Face-to-Face Dialogue <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Open house and expo-type formats / informal, face-to-face between applicants and public ▪ Less intimidating environment - Use existing, established community organizations to tap into the community - CVRC Directors attend meetings of existing, established community groups - City of San Diego's neighborhood groups/community planning groups • Not Worked Well <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Public input only at formal CVRC meetings - Time restrictions for public testimony (3 or 5 min.) - Established community groups are not formally recognized by City Hall - Existing community organizations were formed from adversarial situations and relationships
<p>Table 6 Sal Salas, CVRC Pamela Bensoussan, RAC Richard D'Ascoli, RAC</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developer goes out to different groups – business & community, multiple forums • Neighborhood & Planning Groups councils work well in other cities (San Diego and National City)

DRAFT

Mary Ladiana, Staff Nancy Lytle, Staff Jim Pieri, Public Michael Spethman, Public	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prop MM projects act as catalyst – met with neighborhood councils; had translators; evening meetings with Spanish and Vietnamese • Don't hold meetings in vacuum; publish agenda; have consistent meeting locations; <u>permanent location</u> make consistent (suggestion of Woman's club) • Adopt calendar with venue • Have pre-review before projects get too developed • Optional meeting
--	--

Question #2: How can we be proactive in gaining the most appropriate level of public input (e.g., sending postcards, knocking on doors, and going out into the community)?

Table 1: Paul Desrochers, CVRC Brian Felber, RAC Lisa Cohen, RAC Gerry Scott, RAC Mandy Mills, Staff Dan Hom, Public	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seek comment from those not in mainstream community loop • Utilize youth commission – new voice • Council Chambers for RAC <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Streaming video - Open doors • See #1
Table 2: Chris Lewis, CVRC Lisa Moctezuma, RAC Eric Mosolgo, RAC Frank Zimmerly, RAC Jim Sandoval, Staff Sarah Johnson, Staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal of a controversial project • Demonstrate how project changed because of public input; example: 24-hour Fitness (Community felt like they were involved because they gave input) • Expand public noticing radius, especially for large projects • Change Council policy – any property that could be affected should be noticed • Follow-up is key • Keep legal roles in mind during one-on-one meetings • Let people know what RAC is • Use friendly tone in approaching people, avoid provocative questions provide way to give written or verbal feedback without going to meeting • Offer to give public comment without filling out card—genuine offer • Don't influence public opinion, only gather information • Challenge members to come in open-minded • RAC members there not just for specific group, but broader Chula Vista • RAC & CVRC should be educated on factual project proposals • RAC member(s) should attend CVRC meetings. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would take a lot of trust for that spokesperson • Minutes may not be enough • Have forum for RAC – CVRC discussions at CVRC meetings • Send RAC minutes (or summary) to CVRC Directors

2-21

DRAFT

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff outlines RAC comments during oral comments • Summary outline of RAC minutes – concerns- go to RAC & CVRC directors-who and why (clarify if it's concerns of 1 person or a group) • CVRC communicate back to RAC on findings and why they made those decisions
Table 3 Doug Paul, CVRC J.J. Hogan, RAC Theresa Acerro, RAC Gregory Smyth, RAC Leilani Hines, Staff Mitch Thompson, Public	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • E-mail lists • Block Captains <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Coordinate with area • Electronic News lists • Door-to-Door • Appropriate – Balance • Don't confuse process <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Public needs - Predictability & Understanding to access process • Need to know project ASAP
Table 4 Hector Reyes, CVRC Lisa Johnson, RAC Lynda Gilgun, RAC Eric Crockett, Staff Diem Do, Staff Edgardo Moctezuma, Public	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hold meetings in East CV • Contact HOA, School District/School near project • CVRC Website • 3-D Model Videoed/Photographed then made available to public via internet/email-site plans, design info, etc. • Web based survey • RAC contact info available – Willingness to accept public input • Rewards program • Convey that public is really being heard, that they're respected (clear process: time limit) • City staff to provide info directly to represented organizations w/RAC Rep as liaison and receiver of comments and information interests/dissemination database provided by reps and affiliates
Table 5 Chris Rooney, CVRC Rafael Muñoz, CVRC Tanya Roviro-Osterwalder, RAC Patricia Aguilar, RAC Ken Lee, Staff Glen Googins, Public	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase Geographic Scope of Public Noticing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Incrementally increase public noticing radius based on pre-determined project thresholds, such as square footage of projects - Be more flexible and creative about noticing beyond 500 feet / Instead of using a radius, identify city blocks or corridors that contain residents/businesses that are most impacted by projects • Recognized Neighborhood Groups <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Establish neighborhood groups that are “officially” recognized by City Hall and establish representative bodies for those neighborhoods through voter election • Unrepresented Populations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Access and engage unrepresented populations through alternative mediums and venues, such as churches, CBOs (community-based organizations), etc. - Provide translation services in other languages

DRAFT

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Begin with education about civic government and civic participation • Meetings in the Community <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - RAC should hold its meetings in the neighborhoods most affected by projects - Use schools as venues to provide facilities that community members are already comfortable with
Table 6 Sal Salas, CVRC Pamela Bensoussan, RAC Richard D'Ascoli, RAC Mary Ladiana, Staff Nancy Lytle, Staff Jim Pieri, Public Michael Spethman, Public	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noticing larger area with larger projects • Workshops • Meet monthly for 6-months • Developer Expo <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Open house prior to Review #1 - Redevelopment Expo - Invites to individual associations - Balance with forming premature discussions - Be aware of Brown Act restrictions

Question #3: What are your ideas about how the RAC could interface with the CVRC (e.g., sharing of information, reporting project status)?

Table 1: Paul Desrochers, CVRC Brian Felber, RAC Lisa Cohen, RAC Gerry Scott, RAC Mandy Mills, Staff Dan Hom, Public	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Semi-annual workshops • Attend each others meetings • Report out project status
Table 2: Chris Lewis, CVRC Lisa Moctezuma, RAC Eric Mosolgo, RAC Frank Zimmerly, RAC Jim Sandoval, Staff Sarah Johnson, Staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 or 4 times a year have a RAC-CVRC field trip to completed projects they've reviewed in the past. • Periodic workshops to evaluate process and continue enhancing communication. • Pursue both predictability for developer and effective public input. • Effective public input will streamline process.
Table 3 Doug Paul, CVRC J.J. Hogan, RAC Theresa Acerro, RAC Gregory Smyth, RAC Leilani Hines, Staff Mitch Thompson, Public	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual Workshop • Merge the two • CVRC participation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - On RAC - Vice Versa - Attn Mtgs • RAC – Presentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To CVRC - Liaison to CVRC (RAC Chair)
Table 4 Hector Reyes, CVRC Lisa Johnson, RAC Lynda Gilgun, RAC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designated liaison between RAC and CVRC • One representative from each body to attend the other meeting (concern re: bias) • Report back to group

DRAFT

Eric Crockett, Staff Diem Do, Staff Edgardo Moctezuma, Public	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fair assessment and view of organizations' views • Minutes summarized instead of so detailed • Board representative to report opinion of individual project instead of city staff • Agenda to place hold time for board rep to speak/present/summarize/dialogue
Table 5 Chris Rooney, CVRC Rafael Muñoz, CVRC Tanya Roviro- Osterwalder, RAC Patricia Aguilar, RAC Ken Lee, Staff Glen Googins, Public	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RAC Agenda & Minutes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Post RAC minutes on the CVRC/RAC web site - Include CVRC Directors in distribution of RAC agendas - Send RAC minutes to CVRC Directors • Project Updates for CVRC <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide the CVRC an ongoing matrix of projects that the RAC is involved in - Provide periodic staff update reports to the CVRC of projects that have gone or are going to the RAC • Direct Participation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Assign the RAC Chair as an ex officio member of the CVRC Board - Periodic reports from the RAC Chair to the CVRC • Joint Working Sessions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ongoing joint working sessions/meetings of the CVRC and RAC - Include RAC in CVRC discussions about programmatic redevelopment decisions
Table 6 Sal Salas, CVRC Pamela Bensoussan, RAC Richard D'Ascoli, RAC Mary Ladiana, Staff Nancy Lytle, Staff Jim Pieri, Public Michael Spethman, Public	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RAC attend CVRC meeting to summarize state vote in favor (staff report – also verbalize) • CVRC attend RAC meeting member(s) • CVRC meets “deal points” financial components RAC and project design after

DRAFT

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE CHULA VISTA REDEVELOPMENT CORPORATION (CVRC)

December 13, 2007

6:00 P.M.

A Regular Meeting of the Chula Vista Redevelopment Corporation was called to order at 6:01 p.m. in the Council Conference Room C-101, located in City Hall, 276 Fourth Avenue, Chula Vista, California.

CVRC ROLL CALL

PRESENT: Directors: Chair Lewis, Vice Chair Desrochers, Munoz, Paul, Rooney
(arrived at 6:15 p.m.), and Salas

ABSENT: Directors: Reyes

ALSO PRESENT: Executive Director Garcia, City Attorney Moore, Redevelopment & Housing Assistant Director Crockett, Senior Project Coordinator Kluth, Assistant Planning Director Hare, Senior Deputy City Clerk Peoples, Senior Administrative Secretary Fields

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE, MOMENT OF SILENCE

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were none.

1. DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. CVRC ROLE IN BAYFRONT DEVELOPMENT

Assistant Planning Director Hare provided an overview of the Bayfront Master Plan and responded to questions of the Board.

Redevelopment & Housing Assistant Director Crockett explained that the role of the CVRC would be advisory to the Planning Commission, and that the Planning Commission would advise the Council on the General Plan, Specific Plan, and Local Coastal Plan.

Chairman Lewis requested staff provide a copy of the Bayfront Master Plan to the Directors.

Redevelopment & Housing Assistant Director Crockett then spoke regarding the proposed Gaylord project, explaining that it was a Port of San Diego land use and lease decision contemplated largely on investment of tax increment. Once an agreement is determined, the CVRC role would be to advise the Redevelopment Agency on the merits of the tax increment.

With regards to the proposed Pacifica project, if the land swap happens and the State approves it, the CVRC would become the design review body to process the project.

2-25

BAYFRONT DISCUSSION ITEM (continued)

Director Desrochers inquired, and staff responded, that there were other properties within the General Plan boundaries that the CVRC would be reviewing in the future, should they come forward with projects.

The following people were present wishing to speak:

Peter Watry, Chula Vista resident and Vice President of Crossroads II, expressed two concerns. One being that the CVRC would try to redo everything that had already been agreed to, although in compromise, regarding the Bayfront Master Plan; and second, a rumor was circulating that prominent Chula Vista's were trying to push out Pacifica which should not be allowed as they were participants in the process from the beginning.

Laura Hunter, representing the Environmental Health Coalition, stated that her organization reluctantly agreed with the compromises previously reached, and requested the CVRC help keep an eye on the project to ensure that the agreements are kept.

Parks Pemberton, Chula Vista resident, spoke regarding concerns with increased traffic along the I-5 that would effect Chula Vista residents, and expressed his opinion that it was wrong to close down and remove the power plant. Further, that consideration should be given to creating a plant that does not pollute, such as a desalination plant, which would work well on the bayfront with the water and salt being in the same location. In closing, he spoke in opposition to the placement of a Charger stadium on the bayfront.

Jennifer Bagley, representing the Electrical Union, prior member of the Citizen Advisory Commission, and member of the San Diego and Imperial County Electricians Union, stated that her organization had recently commissioned a pole of local Chula Vista residents and asked them what they wanted to see on their bayfront. The results indicated that they wanted respect for the environment and something that would bring good local jobs. She stated that she would e-mail a copy of the survey to Chairman Lewis for distribution to the Board.

B. SWEETWATER UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT WORKSHOP

Redevelopment & Housing Assistant Director Crockett provided a brief overview of the Sweetwater Union High School District proposal and project history. He provided a locator map and indicated the current properties owned by the District and their intended uses. He stated that the Third Avenue site was exchanged with the District in the early 1980's with the hopes of moving the district offices to that site. The District also wanted to relocate their corporate yards from 5th Avenue. In 2005 the District purchased the L Street site for \$28 million during the height of the real-estate boom, with the new intent to relocate all other property uses there, and then sell the original properties for residential use. The Redevelopment Agency had rejected a proposal from the District in 2004 due to the risk to the Agency and City, as well as the District. They also rejected a proposal in 2006 wherein the District proposed a land use change of the L Street property to mixed use for the relocation of the Adult School, Administration Office, and new residential. The estimated cost of the project was \$163 million, and their request was for \$160 million from the Agency. Then finally, the District came back in October 2007 with a new proposal, which was presented to the CVRC. Mr. Crockett stated that there have been two goals since the land swap in 1995 between the District and the Agency: 1) to relocate the Administration Office to Third Avenue, and 2) to get the Corporate Yard off of 5th. None of the proposals thus far have addressed these goals, and what is needed is a common understanding regarding land use and the process to be followed.

DRAFT

SWEETWATER UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT WORKSHOP (continued)

Chairman Lewis, as a member of the appointed subcommittee who met with the SUHSD representatives, stated that the proposed project, if done correctly, could be a nice starter project for the CVRC and would kick-start revenues. The applicant needs assistance in understanding the right way to approach the project. He then stated that he had invited Director Paul to join the subcommittee.

Director Desrochers, subcommittee member, stated that he concurred that the Third Avenue property was bought specifically to stimulate the area, as was the moving of the 5th Avenue Corp. Yard. He expressed concerns with the amount of tax increment funding the District wants from the Agency as the State Law is specific with regards to use of tax increment, and it appears that the District wants the Agency to contribute to the entire development, which is not legally feasible. He then expressed hope that an acceptable project could be developed.

Executive Director Garcia stated that the frustration being expressed by the District was due to their plans being rejected, but he also stated that the percentage of monetary participation the District expects from the Agency is growing, with Chula Vista being the major investor, and with no accountability of the players. A constructive discussion needs to be made to determine the best way to proceed. Mr. Garcia further stated that the District wants a private deal with a developer using Redevelopment Agency funds.

Director Munoz stated that he had done some research into the process for this type of project, and the apparent discrepancy is that the District does not appear to want to follow the City review process like everyone else, which is a different process than the process for building a school.

Director Salas stated that he would like to see the emphasis on the Corporate Yard and the Moss and 4th Avenue properties, as it appeared that the focus was all on L Street, and that that was what was dragging the project down.

Redevelopment & Housing Assistant Director Crockett stated that the concerns with L Street are that although the property has potential, they have bonds with capitalized interest that will become due in 2011 at approximately \$32 million. He also stated that the Third Avenue property only has nine years left for investment. Once it expires in 2013, no more money can be put into it.

Director Munoz inquired as to why the move of the District Administrative Offices to Third Avenue had not occurred. Director Desrochers responded that he recalled parking had been an issue.

Chair Lewis stated that he understood that the District wanted to retain ownership of the Corporate Yard on 5th Avenue and was concerned with what the motive behind the reasoning was. The current bottom line on the proposal was that it was a very costly endeavor with very little return. He then proposed that the next step be for the Subcommittee to get back together with the District representatives and create a proposal to start working on.

2-27

SWEETWATER UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT WORKSHOP (continued)

Executive Director Garcia stated there needed to be a reasonable pro-forma, and a reasonable partner.

2. CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORTS

There were none.

3. CHAIRMAN'S REPORTS

Chairman Lewis stated that the Subcommittee was going to move forward on the items that came out of the workshop held with the RAC. They will address those issues and bring a report back to the full Board. He stated further that he had requested Directors Munoz and Salas, along with Lisa Moctezuma to iron out the roles and responsibilities.

Chair Lewis then stated he had been invited to attend a citizen brainstorming session on the potential uses for the old Social Security Building. He spoke regarding the Citizen Advisory Commission that had worked on the Bayfront Master Plan and how it had been a 3-4 year project with diverse personalities and levels of education and opinion, and that in the end, 22 people came together to create the Master Plan, proving miracles do happen. He then wished everyone a wonderful holiday.

4. DIRECTORS' COMMENTS

Director Desrochers proposed consideration by the Urban Land Institute Advisory Council for one development in the City, perhaps the Superior Court at Third and H Street. He stated that it would be an advisory service at a minimal cost, but might provide a good opportunity for a property that needs involvement. He then requested a report back by staff on the potential use.

Director Salas commented on the workshop setting for meetings, and requested that the format be continued into the new-year, where every other meeting be held in a similar setting.

ADJOURNMENT

At 7:31 p.m., Chairman Lewis adjourned the meeting to the Regular Meeting of January 10, 2008 at 6:00 p.m.

Eric Crockett, Secretary

2-28